

Plutarch's *Philopoemen and Flamininus*

SIMON SWAIN

## I

As a promoter of Hellenic culture and a participant in Greek politics, as well as a friend of important men at Rome, Plutarch had good reason to address present day relations between the cities of Greece and the Roman state (in *De exil.*, *An seni resp. ger. sit*, *Praec. ger. reip.*). But how did he see their past relations? Roman involvement in Greece is touched on in a number of the Roman *Lives* (for example, *Luc.*, *Sul.*). But in one pair, *Phil.-Flam.*, Plutarch had to portray the attitudes of Greece and Rome to one another more extensively at the very time that Roman power was beginning to deprive Greece of her liberty. This pair gains special vitality from the unique appearance of one hero in the *Life* of the other, and the like structure demands careful attention to similarities and differences which Plutarch has introduced in the careers of the two subjects. In the following pages I explore *Phil.* and *Flam.* individually, and then consider them as a pair.

*Phil.* 1–5 are introductory chapters where Plutarch typically outlines his hero's character and aims, and brings out the important themes of benefaction, ambition, and contentiousness which recur through the narrative.<sup>1</sup>

Philopoemen's political life begins in c. 5 “when he was thirty years of age.” After winning fame at Sellasia (6. 7, 7. 1), he never looks back.<sup>2</sup> His policy is contrasted with that of Aratus in c. 8. Aratus had achieved the political unity of the Achaean League at the price of using προστάταις ἐπεισάκτοις (8. 6), Macedonians,<sup>3</sup> “whereas Philopoemen . . . increased

Translations have been based on the Loeb edition by B. Perrin (London/Cambridge Mass. 1921).

<sup>1</sup> Benefaction: 1. 5, 11. 3–4, 15. 2, 21. 12, *synk.* 1. 1. Φιλοτιμία: 3. 1, 6. 10, 7. 5, 9. 13, 13. 1; for the idea, cf. 4. 10, 7. 1, 11. 2–3, 13. 5; at 9. 7 φιλοτιμία is used of the Achaeans, at 15. 1 of Flamininus. Φιλονικία: 3. 1 bis, 17. 7, *synk.* 1. 4, 1. 7; for the idea, cf. 13. 8, 16. 3; φιλονικία is used of Greece at 18. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 7. 3, 7. 9, 12. 1, 14. 1, 15. 1, 19. 1, 21. 9–11, *synk.* 2. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Arat.* 16. 4 (Macedon is an ἐπακτὸν ἀρχὴν . . . ἀλλόφυλον), *Ag./Cleom.* 37. 7.

not only the power but also the will of the Achaeans, who were accustomed to winning under him and to being successful in most of their contests."<sup>4</sup>

Their main success came at the battle of Mantinea against the Spartan tyrant Machanidas (c. 10). As a consequence of this Philopoemen put on a military display of the winning force at the Nemean Games in the following summer of 206 B.C.,<sup>5</sup> and we are told (at 11. 3 sq.) that, "just as they made their entrance Pylades the citharode happened to be singing the opening verse of the *Persians* of Timotheus, 'Glorious the crown of freedom which he fashioneth for Hellas,' [§ 4] whereupon . . . all the spectators turned their eyes on Philopoemen and applauded him joyfully. For in their hopes the Greeks were recovering their ancient prestige [ἀξίωμα], and in their will they were getting very close to the spirit of their past."<sup>6</sup>

Philopoemen is inspired by Greek sentiment, especially ἐλευθερία, and though he is not comparable with Flamininus in the scale of his benefactions (*synkrisis* 1. 1), he is a benefactor of Greece. His εὐεργεσίαι are not only material, but are also spiritual. This is explicit in the record of the Nemean Games. It is no coincidence that Flamininus' announcement of the total liberation of Greece at the Isthmian and Nemean Games occurs more or less at the same point in his *Life*. It is the most important common theme of the pair, and one most dear to Plutarch who several times laments the Greeks' loss of liberty to the Hellenistic kings.<sup>7</sup>

Philopoemen is (*Phil.* 1. 6 sq.) "a late-begotten child [ὀψίγονος] which Hellas bore in old age as a successor to the ἀρεταί of her ancient commanders . . . and a certain Roman . . . called him 'last of the Greeks.'"<sup>8</sup> At *De amic. mult.* 94a Plutarch says we ought to ask for one true and dear friend among our others who is, as Homer puts it, τηλύγετός τις καὶ ὀψίγονος. Philopoemen is loved by Greece, and is a loyal and true friend to her. In c. 1 we learn that he was imbued with Hellenism from his early years. Kleandros, the friend of Philopoemen's deceased father, brought him up "rather as Homer says Achilles was reared by Phoenix, so that from the very outset his character took on a noble and kingly form and growth" (1. 2). Later he came under the care of the philosopher politicians Ekdelos and Demophanes: "they certainly counted the education of Philopoemen among their other deeds, thinking that by means of philosophy they had turned out a man who was a κοινὸν ὄφελος to Greece" (1. 5).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Polybius ii. 40. 2: (Philopoemen) ἀγωνιστὴν δὲ καὶ τελεσιουργόν.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. R. Errington, *Philopoemen* (Oxford 1968) 250.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Dio of Prusa xxxi *Rhodian* 157, τὸ κοινὸν ἀξίωμα of Hellas.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Phil.* 15. 2, *Demosth.* 19. 1, *Phoc.* 1. 4, *Ag./Cleom.* 37. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Arat. 24. 2. As J. Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217-86 v. Chr.* (Berlin 1971) 125, notes, there is nothing in the tradition to indicate the appellation is "cynical" (Errington [*op. cit.*, n. 5], 218)—Plutarch certainly did not take it that way (cf. *Brut.* 44. 2: "[Brutus] called Cassius the last man among the Romans, implying that it was no longer possible for a spirit so great to arise in the city").

One of Plutarch's sources for *Phil.* was probably the encomium written in three books by Polybius (see Polybius x. 21). There is no cause to look elsewhere for the early biographical details. But it is not merely due to Polybius' interest that these have been introduced strongly in the first chapter of Plutarch's *Life*. Education was plainly important to Plutarch, and heroes' possession of Hellenic παιδεία may entail respect for Greece.<sup>9</sup> The notes on Philopoemen's upbringing serve the purpose of emphasizing his commitment to Hellenic thought and to the idea that the right sort of education may relate to the right sort of action.

The values inculcated into Philopoemen make it natural that he opposed Rome's advancing power in Greece. The presentation of the advance and of Philopoemen's opposition is interesting. There is nothing in the *Life* about Flamininus' complete liberation of Hellas. In c. 14 Philopoemen returns from Crete to find Philip defeated. Here there could have been a note on the liberation of the Greeks, which would not have been entirely irrelevant. Instead we straight away have a clash between Philopoemen and Flamininus. The nature of the discord is rivalry (on Flamininus' part) about who benefited Greece more. Philopoemen, on putting down Nabis, is highly honoured by the Greeks and thus secretly upsets Flamininus, who is φιλότιμος (15. 1) and thought he should have received more honour than Philopoemen because he had freed those parts of Greece which were subject to Macedon. In *Phil.* the spotlight is on Philopoemen (τιμώμενος ἐκπρεπῶς); the implication is that the honours paid to him surpass those paid to Flamininus (at *Flam.* 13. 2—the same incident—Philopoemen gets equal honour, which annoys Flamininus just as much). It does seem that Plutarch is keen in *Phil.* to stress Philopoemen's genuine popularity with the Greeks (1. 6, 11. 4, 15. 1; cf. 10. 13); note how honours often come in the sequence of liberating wars against tyrants (Machanidas, Nabis; cf. his glory in the battle of Sellasia against Cleomenes). Flamininus receives gratitude—that is something different.<sup>10</sup>

Chapters 16 and 17 are particularly important for Philopoemen's attitude to Rome. In 16 he warns Diophanes, the Achaean general for 191 B.C., not to provoke trouble in the Peloponnese, "when Antiochus and the Romans are hovering with so many armies," then prevents Diophanes and Flamininus from reaching Sparta. Plutarch does not approve of this, labelling it "an act which was not lawful, still less produced by just principles"; but there is a degree of admiration when he hails it as "great and prompted by a great spirit." In 17 we hear of Philopoemen's opinions on the war against Antiochus: he begrudged the Romans their victory because of Antiochus' sloth and luxury. "When the Romans," Plutarch continues

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Luc.* 1. 4–8, 7. 4–7, 20. 1–6, *Cim.* 1–2; *Marc.* 1. 2–3, 19. 6, 20. 1, 21. 7; *Aem.* 2. 6, 28; I discuss this matter along with the general importance Plutarch attached to education, especially for Roman heroes, in an article to appear in *JHS*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Luc.* 23. 3 where Lucullus enjoys real popularity and good-will among the Greeks.

(17. 2 sq.), "had conquered Antiochus, they were already becoming more closely involved with Greek affairs, and were encompassing the Achaeans in their power as the demagogues inclined to their support. Their strength, with the help of the δαίμων, was growing great in all areas, and the end was near to which fate decreed the fortune [of Greece] must come in its due cycle. Here, Philopoemen, like a good helmsman contending against high seas, was on some subjects compelled to give in and yield to the times. But in most he continued his opposition by attempting to draw those who were powerful in speech or action in the direction of freedom."

This most important statement about Philopoemen's opposition to Rome covers the years following the defeat of Antiochus, for which no detailed narrative is given. It is interesting that Plutarch does portray Philopoemen opposing the Romans in this period, for it is unclear how Polybius treated his attitude. Certainly in his defence of Philopoemen before Mummius at Corinth in 146 B.C. Polybius concentrated on Philopoemen's policy at the time of the wars against Philip and Antiochus, and perhaps deliberately skirted over the period between Antiochus' defeat and Philopoemen's death, the period of clashes of policy with Rome.<sup>11</sup> There are, though, some traces of opposition activity in the general assessment of Philopoemen at xxiv. 11. 1-13. 10, the comparison and contrast with Aristainos. The occasion for this posthumous (cf. xxiii. 12) evaluation is probably the embassy of Kallikrates to Rome in 181 B.C. (xxiv. 8. 1-10. 15). The patriotic, though contrasting, views of Philopoemen and Aristainos are no doubt intended to show the basic consensus of earlier Achaean politicians, since Polybius says that Kallikrates' prompting was the first occasion when Rome was invited to think of self-interest in Greek affairs (xxiv. 10. 2 sq.).<sup>12</sup> Plutarch knew that Polybius had chosen to understand Rome's methods too late (*Phil.* 17. 2), and he clearly believed that Philopoemen's resistance to Rome was more than a rumour (Polybius xxiv. 13. 10).

Plutarch's departure from Polybius on these matters may explain his different positioning of the contrast between Philopoemen and Aristainos (17. 4). His context suggests the League synod of 191 B.C. (cf. Livy xxxvi. 35. 7), since he cites as an example of Philopoemen's independence his resistance to the requests of Flamininus and M'. Acilius to restore the Spartan exiles (17. 6-7). It may be that Plutarch has inserted the contrast haphazardly,<sup>13</sup> but more probably the positioning is deliberate, and the opportunity is taken to use the contrast between the two Achaean politicians

<sup>11</sup> F. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. iii (Oxford 1979) 732; cf. Errington [*op. cit.*, n. 5] 222.

<sup>12</sup> Naturally Polybius saw that Rome's involvement in Greece had already become much closer as a result of the wars against Philip and Antiochus (xxiv. 11. 3).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Walbank [*op. cit.*, n. 11] 264.

to flesh out the increasing emergence of Philopoemen's contentiousness against Rome.

The following chapters (18–21) deal with Philopoemen's death fighting Deinokrates of Messene. The theme of Greek freedom and Roman encroachment is not relevant, for the whole action concentrates on Philopoemen the man and his death. In the final chapter of the *Life* Plutarch does return to this major theme, albeit from a different angle. At 21. 10 he records that many statues of Philopoemen were set up in the cities, and then mentions a proposal by a Roman following the sack of Corinth that the statues be destroyed, since Philopoemen was an enemy of Rome. After some debate Mummius and his staff decide not to allow the honours to be destroyed, "although he [Philopoemen] had made considerable opposition to Flamininus and Acilius. These judges distinguished, it would seem, between virtue and necessity, and between honour and advantage. They rightly and properly considered it was always the case that benefactors ought to receive reward and gratitude from their beneficiaries, and good men honour from the good."<sup>14</sup> The final message of the *Life* hails the justice of Mummius and his commissioners in upholding the statues of Philopoemen despite his opposition to Rome. These later Romans recognize that Philopoemen's opposition did not stem from idle reasons. Plutarch is happy to agree with them.

So, at the beginning of the *Life* Philopoemen is the inheritor and promoter of the Greeks' antique virtues (1. 6); at the end it is for virtue and nobility that he receives posthumous commendation from Rome.

## II

The reader or hearer would approach *Flam.* with Rome's later vindication of Philopoemen (and Plutarch's agreement) in the forefront of his mind. *Flam.* follows the form of *Phil.* In c. 1 the main points of the hero's character are laid out. Plutarch comments on Flamininus' preference for doing favours rather than receiving them, and on his general stance as a benefactor (1. 2). This is the most important theme of the *Life*.<sup>15</sup> Going with it is the idea of the liberator.<sup>16</sup> There is a further link with Flamininus' desire for φιλοτιμία

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Pel.-Marc. synk.* 3. 10, *De cap. ex inim. util.* 91a.

<sup>15</sup> Benefaction: 12. 6, 12. 8, 13. 3, 15. 3, 15. 6–9, 16. 4, *synk.* 1. 1, 3. 4; cf. Nero at 12. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Liberation: 5. 8, 10. 5 sqq., 12. 6, 12. 11.

and δόξα. Φιλοτιμία is stressed heavily.<sup>17</sup> Love of δόξα is also prominent.<sup>18</sup>

Hellenic sympathies are clearly important in the presentation of Flamininus (cf. 2. 3, 5. 6–8). However, Plutarch has nothing comparable to the notes on Philopoemen (cf. 1. 4—Flamininus' παιδεία consisted of τὰ στρατιωτικά). The cause is Plutarch's awareness that Greek educational methods at Rome were not freely available at this time, together with a lack of material from which to reconstruct,<sup>19</sup> and the omission does not undermine Flamininus' Hellenic outlook.

Plutarch begins the narrative by bringing out Flamininus' energy and motivation, his youth (2. 2 "he was not yet thirty years of age," the same age as Philopoemen when first active, *Phil.* 5. 1), and his diplomacy (2. 3). This was the first time, Plutarch says, that Greece was brought into close contact with Romans, and unless their commander had been "a naturally good man who employed words instead of war . . . and laid the greatest stress on what was just, [Greece] would not so easily have welcomed an ἀλλόφυλον ἀρχήν in the place of those she was accustomed to." Plutarch adds (2. 5),

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ δηλοῦται.

This statement—or its equivalent—is on several occasions to be found near the beginning of a text and/or after remarks of an introductory nature, asking the reader or hearer to examine the truth of what has been said from what follows.<sup>20</sup> Here we are invited to judge from the narrative not so much of the character of Flamininus, but of the methods by which Greece came to accept foreign dominion.

Plutarch comments on Greek views at 5. 6 sqq.: "they had heard the Macedonians say that a commander of a barbarian army was marching against them subduing and enslaving everything through force of arms. Then, when they met a man who was young in years, humane in appearance, a Hellene in voice and language, and a lover of true honour, they were amazed and charmed . . . (5. 8) and then at last it became quite clear even to the partisans of Philip that the Romans had come to wage war not on the Greeks, but on the Macedonians on behalf of the Greeks."

<sup>17</sup> Φιλοτιμία: 1. 3, 3. 3, 5. 3, 7. 2 ἰσχυρῶς, 9. 5, 17. 2—against Philopoemen, 20. 1, *synk.* 1. 4; cf. 12. 11–12; it is used at 6. 5 of Aulus, 7. 4 of the Romans and Macedonians; the related concepts of φιλονικία and ζηλοτυπία are used of Flamininus at 13. 2 (φιλονικία is used also of Greece at 11. 6).

<sup>18</sup> Love of δόξα: 1. 3 bis, 7. 2, 13. 2, 20. 2, 21. 1, *synk.* 2. 2; cf. 16. 5–7, 17. 1; it occurs at 15. 2, 21. 10 in a different sense applied to others.

<sup>19</sup> The result is seen in Flamininus' surrender in later years to unseasonable ambition (controlled by education, *De virt. mor.* 452d).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Mar.* 2. 4; *Aratus* 10. 5; *Per.* 2. 5, 9. 1; *Cim.* 3. 3; *Ag./Cleom.* 2. 9; *Phoc.* 3. 9; *Quaest. con.* vii intro. 697e.

At 2. 5 Plutarch had described the Roman hegemony as an ἀλλόφυλος ἀρχή (cf. 11. 7). The same expression is applied to Macedon at *Arat.* 16. 4. However, Rome and Macedon are not to be equated, for Macedon was an unwelcome power. Indeed, its interference in the Peloponnese at the invitation of Aratus was tantamount to the barbarization of the area (id. 38. 6–7, *Ag./Cleom.* 37.7). Thus it is that Plutarch is keen to emphasize that Rome is not in any way βάρβαρος (*Flam.* 5. 6), and that far from coming to enslave Greece, the Romans had come to liberate her from Macedon (5. 8).

In keeping with this presentation, Flaminius' duplicity in the embassy sent after the conference of Nicaea<sup>21</sup> is held to be due to his being φιλότιμος . . . ἰσχυρῶς and concerned for his δόξα (7. 2), and there is no hint that he was ready to betray the Greeks.<sup>22</sup> Plutarch is in no doubt that Flaminius would have made peace had a successor been appointed, but there seems to be no criticism of his motives so far as Greece is concerned, perhaps because Flaminius did make a very satisfactory peace for the Greeks a little later (9. 8).

The central chapters (10 and 11) of the *Life* are perhaps the most important. In 10 Plutarch records the proclamation at the Isthmian Games in 196 B.C.<sup>23</sup> In 11 he records the resulting opinions of the Greeks, contrasting Flaminius favourably with "men like Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades," and pointing out that most of the Greeks' wars had been against themselves, whereas "ἀλλόφυλοι ἄνδρες who were thought to have only slight sparks and insignificant traces of a common remote ancestry . . . had undergone the greatest dangers and hardships to rescue Greece and set her free from harsh despots and tyrants" (11. 7). The thoughts put into the mouths of others are Plutarch's own.<sup>24</sup> Parallel versions in Polybius and Livy both have comments on the Roman action of liberating Greece (xviii. 46. 13–15; xxxiii. 33. 5–8). Their remarks are about Rome, her ideals, power, and virtue. There is, especially in Livy, an element of romance. Plutarch is different: he dwells on Greece, and on the distinctively Greek flaws of φιλονικία and the inability to live in peace.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The conference has been alluded to at 5. 8 (the relation between conference and embassy is obscured by the anachronistic accession of Boeotia in c. 6). C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971) 95, holds that Flaminius' peace offer to Philip at 5. 8 is that made at the river Aous rather than at Nicaea; a comparison of Plutarch's narrative with that of Livy shows that this is not so.

<sup>22</sup> On Flaminius' aims at Nicaea, see E. Badian, *Titus Quinctius Flaminius, Philhellenism and Realpolitik* (Cincinnati 1970) 40 sqq.

<sup>23</sup> This is made more dramatic by the return of the "fetters of Greece"—Demetrius, Chalcis, (Acro-)Corinth—before the announcement; cf. Polybius xviii. 45. 12, Livy xxxiv. 50. 8, 51. 1–4.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. e. g., *Phoc.* 28. 3, *Pomp.* 70, *Sul.* 12. 9–14.

<sup>25</sup> See C.B.R. Pelling, "Synkrisis in Plutarch's Lives," *Miscellanea Plutarchea* (Ferrara 1986) 83–96, 85.

In c. 12 Flaminius proclaims the freedom of Greece again at the Nemean Games. The proclamation in fact took place after the war against Nabis in 195 B.C., not before, as here, and concerned the Argives only (Livy xxxiv. 41). Plutarch is eager to restate Flaminius' commitment to liberation, and to hail his policy of instilling εὐνομία, ὁμόνοια, and φιλοφροσύνη into the Greek cities (12. 6), reminding us of Aratus at *Phil.* 8. 3 (ὁμόνοια καὶ πολιτεία). At *Flam.* 12. 8 Plutarch comments in his own right on Greek attitudes towards Rome: "in the case of Flaminius and the Romans the gratitude of the Greeks for the benefits they received led not only to expressions of praise, but also to confidence among all men and to power δικαίως." The Romans had acted justly, and hence the Greeks came over to them (cf. 5. 4–6). "The result was that within a short time—and perhaps God was lending a helping hand—everything became ὑπήκοα to them. But he [Flaminius] himself took most pride in the liberation of Hellas" (12. 10–11).

Compare with this *Phil.* 11. 4 and 17. 2–3 (Philopoemen at the Nemean Games; his opposition to increasing Roman power). In *Flam.* the Greeks are grateful to Flaminius and the Romans, but the latter have no genuine popularity. They had restored to the Greeks their freedom, but unlike Philopoemen they had not been able to restore to them their παλαιὸν ἀξίωμα (*Phil.* 11. 4). Rome's actions in Greece on behalf of Greece could be presented as liberation or domination. In *Phil.* there is nothing of the former, and 17. 2 sq. emphasizes the latter. Philopoemen is presented as struggling against forces outside his control in the manner of Phocion or Cato Minor (*Phoc.* 1–3). In *Flam.* the tone is one of liberation and gratitude. The Greeks voluntarily join the Romans. The Romans treat the Greeks with respect, and the policy of liberation is conscious (2; 11. 7).<sup>26</sup> Even the rôle of the divine is open to doubt (12. 10), as it is not at *Phil.* 17. 2.

The presentation accords carefully with the manner most suitable for either *Life*. It is difficult to gauge Plutarch's own view. At *Flam.* 12. 13 he notes that in his own time Nero had, like Flaminius, chosen Corinth to proclaim the Greeks "free and autonomous." Nero's grant of freedom in 67 A.D. (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 814) must have made an impression on the Greeks, spiritually and economically. It was an event which had stuck in Plutarch's mind (cf. *De sera num. vind.* 568a); but it seems likely that its abrogation by Vespasian (Pausanias vii. 17. 4) was remembered by him also (and accounts in part for his strong dislike of that emperor, *Amat.* 771c). His narration of the first declaration of liberty in 196 B.C. is not "naïve and uncritical."<sup>27</sup> He is aware of the expediency at the back of Flaminius' policy. Note again how unromanticized the philhellenism is—it stems partly from Flaminius'

<sup>26</sup> Plutarch's failure to give a cause of Rome's war against Philip (i. e. his alliance with Hannibal) makes its intervention seem all the more noble.

<sup>27</sup> A. Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives* (London 1974) 129.



own personal desire to be a benefactor and to receive honour, partly from Roman awareness of the best way of making an ἀλλόφυλος ἀρχὴ acceptable to Greece (2. 5). Plutarch realizes Greek failings and appreciates Roman benefits, but he is not interested in rehearsing Roman propaganda about idealized liberation. He knew that it was only a little later that the Romans came to control everything in Greece and the Greek East (*Phil.* 17. 2; *Flam.* 12. 10), just as he knew very well that the proclamation of Nero was only of temporary effect.<sup>28</sup> We should distinguish Flamininus himself from Rome—as Plutarch does: showing typical care for his hero he deliberately states that Flamininus continued to take pride in his liberation (12. 11).

This concern to preserve Flamininus' claims to be the liberator of Greece is noticeable also in the narration of the war against Antiochus and even in the peace made with the tyrant Nabis (13–16). In c. 17 Plutarch goes on to summarize his hero's attitude to the Greeks in a series of apophthegms. These are designed to illustrate his character before the narration of his activities at Rome (18–21).

I turn now to consider the characterization of the two men together.

### III

That the presentation of liberation or domination differs in each *Life* is partly due to the need to distinguish the heroes. Yet this is not the whole story—it does seem that Plutarch is also distinguishing and presenting discrete interpretations of the historical events, for the characteristics of the two men are quite similar.

Sufficient work has been done in recent years to make it clear that Plutarch envisages a common base between his heroes and demonstrably incorporates common themes in either half of the paired *Lives*.<sup>29</sup> There is no cause to see *Phil.–Flam.* as exceptional in this respect. In this pair Plutarch's moral/ethical interests focus on φιλοτιμία with its neighbouring traits of φιλονικία and φιλοδοξία. He might seem to have characterized Flamininus with the more neutral quality of φιλοτιμία, and Philopoemen with the ostensibly worse quality of φιλονικία, especially in the *synkrisis*.<sup>30</sup> At *Phil.* 3. 1 Philopoemen is typified by φιλονικία and ὀργή, qualities not really brought out in the following narrative.<sup>31</sup> But the

<sup>28</sup> The methods of Roman control (invitation by factions and demagogues—*Flam.* 12. 9–10, *Phil.* 17. 2) were familiar to him from the present too (*Praec. ger. reip.* 814e sqq.).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. H. Erbse, "Die Bedeutung der Synkrisis in den Parallelbiographien Plutarchs," *Hermes* 84 (1956) 398–424; P. A. Stadter, "Plutarch's Comparison of Pericles and Fabius Maximus," *GRBS* 16 (1975) 77–85; J. Geiger, "Plutarch's Parallel Lives: the Choice of Heroes," *Hermes* 109 (1981) 85–104; Pelling [*op. cit.*, n. 25].

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Pelling [*op. cit.*, n. 25] 84–89; generally Wardman [*op. cit.*, n. 27] 115–24. The distinction between φιλοτιμία and φιλονικία is the basis of a very different approach to *Phil.–Flam.* in an as yet unpublished paper by Joseph Walsh.

<sup>31</sup> Φιλονικία occurs 3. 1 bis, 17. 7; ὀργή occurs 3. 1 bis, 17. 5.

primary quality at 3. 1 is τὸ φιλότιμον. This was "not altogether free of φιλονικία nor devoid of ὀργή." What Plutarch says here is that φιλονικία was a facet of Philopoemen's ambition, not that it was permanently displayed (the same is true of anger). Similarly, when he adds that Philopoemen could not always "remain true" (ἐμμένειν) to Epaminondas' πρᾶον, βαθύ, and φιλάνθρωπον, he does not mean that these statesmanlike qualities were entirely unknown to him (cf. 16. 1-3), but that he had a soldierly rather than a political ἀρετή. Plutarch does not deny Polybius' testimony to Philopoemen's political skills (xxiii. 12. 8-9).

With Flamininus φιλοτιμία is again the key element in the character and lies behind his good and bad points. He is in fact (1. 3) φιλοτιμώτατος. He is also (ib.) φιλοδοξώτατος. Rather than combining τὸ φιλότιμον with τὸ φιλόκαλον as one ought (*De cap. ex inim. util.* 92d), Flamininus' φιλοτιμία is associated with δόξα. This is its aim when it goes to the bad, especially towards the end of his life (7. 2, 20. 1, 21. 1),<sup>32</sup> and δόξα is the counterpart of Philopoemen's φιλονικία (at 13. 2 δόξα is linked with φιλονικία and ζηλοτυπία).

There are a number of passages which demonstrate that for Plutarch φιλονικία, φιλοτιμία, and even φιλοδοξία were really very similar. Both φιλοτιμία and φιλονικία may be good<sup>33</sup> as well as bad,<sup>34</sup> and the pursuit of δόξα naturally has points of contact with the other two terms.<sup>35</sup>

There are naturally differences between Philopoemen and Flamininus, but they share as their leading characteristic φιλοτιμία and its associated traits. This characterization is far stronger and more obvious than anything in the tradition. Consider Philopoemen. In Livy there is nothing on his ambition or contentiousness against the Romans. Philopoemen is praised for his military ability (xxv. 26. 10, 28. 1), and held to excel all of his time in *prudencia* and *auctoritas* (xxv. 25. 7). Only an excerpt from Polybius testifying to his having been φιλοδοξήσας in politics (xxiii. 12. 8; cf. similarly 14. 1 of Scipio; in Plutarch's treatment it is of course Flamininus who must pursue glory) and other passages indicating a readiness to dispute with fellow-politicians or with Rome (xxii. 19, xxiii. 5. 13-18, xxiv. 11. 6-8, 13. 1-10) offer a clue.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Sul.* 7. 2: φιλοτιμία and δοξομανία are the "ageless passions."

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *De virt. mor.* 452b: lawgivers have included φιλοτιμία (and ζήλος) in constitutions, i. e. at Sparta; *Ages.* 5. 5 (ὑπέκκαυμα τῆς ἀρετῆς . . . τὸ φιλότιμον καὶ φιλότιμον), *Lys.* 2. 4.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Ages.* 5. 7 ("excessive φιλονικία . . . entail great dangers"), *Ag./Cleom.* 2. 3 (perils of excessive πολιτικαὶ φιλοτιμίας), *Arist.-Cat. synk.* 5. 4 (φιλοτιμία is "troublesome and highly productive of envy"), *Praec. ger. reip.* (dangers of public φιλονικία: e. g. 819b, 825a, 825e; of public φιλοτιμία: 819f-820f, 825f).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. esp. *Ag./Cleom.* 1-2; for 1. 2 (the erroneous identification of glory with virtue), cf. *Coriol.* 4. 5, and note that the only mention of Flamininus' ἀρετή is in the context of his love of glory (*Flam.* 1. 3).

Again, Flamininus is not associated with rank ambition and craving for fame. For example, his ambition is given great play in *Flam.* 7 (cf. 7. 2 ἰσχυρῶς), which concerns his aim of proroguing his command. Compare Polybius and Livy. Polybius may attribute some duplicity to Flamininus concerning his private conversation with Philip on the second day of the conference at Nicaea (xviii. 8. 8); nothing is made obvious though. Perhaps the Livian version (xxxii. 32. 6–8) lends itself more readily to identifying a leading characteristic, which Plutarch exaggerates; cf. similar worries of Flamininus about the war with Nabis (xxxiv. 33. 14). On another occasion, however, Plutarch deliberately departs from Livy: Flamininus' φιλοτιμία emerges for him most strongly in the embassy to Prusias at the end of the *Life*, whereas Livy makes fear of Hannibal a principal reason for the embassy (Plutarch notes this at *Flam.* 21. 14), imputes no base motives to him, and in the final sentence of Hannibal's speech—omitted in Plutarch's translation at 20. 10–11—speaks of Flamininus' mission as official (xxxix. 51. 11).

What emerges from this is the deliberate introduction of similar traits for the two heroes. We have the common technique where Plutarch explores a certain characteristic and shows the strengths and weaknesses it may bring out in a man. Given this, is it significant with regard to Philopoemen that one of Plutarch's criticisms of the Greek generals of old at *Flam.* 11. 6 concerns their φιλονικία? Since both Philopoemen and Flamininus have closely related defects in their ambitious natures, including contentiousness, it is unlikely that Plutarch is here stigmatizing Philopoemen. Nevertheless, in the *Praec. ger. reip.* he does recommend avoiding the strife and discord of previous generations of politicians, and at 825d–f he singles out φιλονικία and ὀργή. Philopoemen is linked with these in his *Life*, and as he is the "last of the Greeks" (1. 7), will have similarities with earlier leaders. But, as we have seen, he is not so crudely damned by Plutarch. And although it is stated at *Flam.* 11. 5 that past leaders did not know how to use their successes πρὸς χάριν εὐγενῇ καὶ τὸ καλόν, at *Phil.* 21. 12 χάρις and τὸ καλόν are among the qualities Plutarch says the Roman judges "correctly and fittingly" ascribed to Philopoemen. It is difficult to resist the view that the last of the Greeks was in fact seen by Plutarch as a genuine benefactor of his country and an inheritor of her ancient virtues rather than vices (1. 6; cf. Polybius xxiii. 12. 3). Plutarch was fully aware that the supremacy of one Greek state entailed the downfall of another—that is why he never exalts the Athenian and Spartan hegemonies. Yet it produced great men. Among individuals, after Timoleon (cf. *Tim.* 29. 5–6, 35, 36. 1–4, 37. 4–6, 39. 7) it is perhaps Philopoemen who is represented as benefiting Greece as far as possible.

Consideration must now be given to the *synkrisis*. Can we detect a preference for one hero over the other? Philopoemen is apparently condemned for φιλονικία in *synkrisis* 1. Why is this so? Simply because this section is about ἀμαρτήματα, not overall character. It is true that

hardly anything is made of Flamininus' faults. On the other hand, Plutarch has been dwelling on Flamininus' failings in cc. 18–21 of his *Life*. We should bear in mind that the *synkriseis* are often not rigorously organized in terms of the space allotted to each hero. So, in c. 3 it is Philopoemen who receives greater treatment than Flamininus, but here to his credit. Really Plutarch is not saying that Philopoemen was a worse man than Flamininus.

One might say that the *synkrisis* has more on Philopoemen than Flamininus. This may be due to the lack of balance and organization common in these pieces. Equally, it may be that Plutarch found Philopoemen a more sympathetic character. Flamininus' status as Greece's most important benefactor is unrivalled. But it is not what Plutarch is most concerned with. In the final section he brings together a principal theme of the *Phil.* (Philopoemen's independence) and the theme he promised to spotlight at *Flam.* 2. 5 (Roman involvement in Greece). At 3. 4 we are told,

Γενναῖα μὲν οὖν Τίτου τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπικηὶ καὶ  
φιλόανθρωπα, γενναιότερα δὲ Φιλοποίμενος τὰ πρὸς τοὺς  
Ῥωμαίους σκληρὰ καὶ φιλελεύθερα· ῥᾶον γὰρ χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς  
δεομένοις ἢ λυπεῖν ἀντιτείνοντα τοὺς δυνατωτέρους (cf. *Flam.* 1.  
3, *Phil.* 17. 3).

Philopoemen is an object of genuine admiration and affection in Plutarch's portrait. Even the end of the *Life* (cc. 18 sqq.)—where he might appear especially quarrelsome—really shows him in a good light. As a mature and elderly statesman his spirit of contention has diminished, and he is looking forward to a quiet old age, mirroring the waning power of Greece (18. 2); Flamininus' later years at Rome are marred by bad statesmanship (19. 7) and immaturity (20. 2). Remember *Phil.* 21. 12, where the reader or listener learns that Philopoemen's benefactions were never made for himself. Coming immediately after this to *Flam.* he finds out that the Roman's benefactions were not altruistic and stemmed from a love of ambition (1. 3). Thus though praised at *synkrisis* 3. 4, Flamininus' benefactions are less *γενναῖα* than Philopoemen's opposition.

The Roman benefited Greece, but the Greek attempted to preserve her freedom (*Phil.* 11. 4, 17. 3). Flamininus was "better" for Greece, and—granted—a better example for inter-Greek relations of any age (but not for political relations in general). Philopoemen's ways were those which caused Greece's downfall. But when Plutarch claims they were *γενναιότερα*, can we deny that he allows himself to be ruled by his heart more than by his head and that he is here expressing his profound admiration?

"The difference [between Philopoemen and Flamininus]," Plutarch continues (3. 5), "is, now they have been examined, hard to define." It is not clear whether he is referring here to the circumstances of their lives or to their characteristics. One could argue both ways. In support of the first view is the fact that they were after all contemporaries and involved to a

large extent in the same theatre of operations. And yet their contacts in the *Lives* are not extensive. They did many different things. Differing circumstances are distinguished in the *synkrisis* (cf. 2. 2, 4; 3. 1). It is better to take Plutarch as thinking in terms of character, for we have seen that the leading characteristics of the two men, that is φιλοτιμία or φιλονικία, are really very similar in his eyes. How, then, are these heroes to be distinguished? "Consider if we have not arbitrated fairly by awarding the Hellene the crown for military and strategic expertise, and the Roman that for justice and goodness of heart" (3. 5). Roman involvement in Greece provides the rationale for this decision.<sup>36</sup> Throughout the pair Flamininus is presented as liberator and benefactor, and in particular is commended for his justness—all of this in his dealings with Greece (cf. *Flam.* 2. 5, 11. 4, 12. 6), for neither justice nor χρηστότης are shown in his domestic politics or in his action against Hannibal. Philopoemen has been a fighter all his life. Most of his military worth was proved against Greeks and was "not happy" for that reason (*synkrisis* 2. 3); but is it not particularly in his resistance to Rome that he is praiseworthy for his fighting spirit (*Phil.* 16. 3; 17. 3, 7) and for which even the Romans commend him (21. 12)? If this is so, we may say that against an historical background of increasing Roman involvement in Greece and declining Greek independence, the qualities Flamininus is attributed at 3. 5 are in no way impaired, while those of Philopoemen are excused and enhanced.

*Wolfson College, Oxford*

<sup>36</sup> Note *Lys.-Sul. synk.* 5. 6 where Sulla is preferred for military skills, Lysander for moral qualities; further, *Ag./Cleom.-Grac. synk.* 5. 7.

